

Tiered Licensure Technical Advisory Committee
October 28, 2013

Attending: Shawn Tiegs (via phone), Lisa Burtenshaw (via video), Mikki Nuckols (via video), Becky Meyer (via video), Andy Grover, Barb Leeds, Paula Kellerer, Robin Nettinga (for Penni Cyr), Tracie Bent, Representative Steven Harris

Superintendent Luna began the meeting by giving opening remarks. He told the group they will be meeting over the next several months to focus on the Task Force for Improving Education's recommendation for tiered licensure. Specifically, the Task Force recommended "a continuum of professional growth and learning that is tied to licensure. Movement through the system would be accomplished in a very specific, objective way using performance measures. Evaluations based upon the Framework for Teaching (FfT) will begin in pre-service and continue throughout a teacher's career. This performance assessment would be supported by multiple artifacts and evidence of the candidate's practice."

The Task Force provided a framework for what might constitute a novice teacher, a professional teacher, or a master teacher, but they did not provide details for how it should be implemented in Idaho. The Task Force unanimously recommended that the "State Department of Education work with stakeholders to clearly determine expectations and authentic measures to earn each tier of the licensure model." That's why the State Department of Education created and convened the technical advisory committee. He told the group that by the time their work was finished, they will know exactly how teachers move through the tiers of licensure and how the system will work in concert with the career ladder that the Task Force also recommended.

Roger Quarles, Chief Deputy at the State Department of Education, introduced himself and explained that he'll be serving as the facilitator for the committee. The committee is made up of members and ex officio members. Members will vote in this committee. Ex officio members won't vote in this committee, because they'll have a vote when it comes to their respective body (i.e. State Board of Education or the Idaho Legislature). Dr. Quarles then asked the committee to introduce themselves. A parent representative and additional ex officio members from the State Board of Education and Legislature will join the committee next month.

Dr. Quarles explained that any recommendations that this committee puts together will have to be implemented through administrative rule, since that's where policy dealing with certification resides. The administrative rule would likely be a temporary rule in order to phase in the recommendations beginning next school year. Robin Nettinga asked whether the rule would be presented this legislative session or the following legislative session. Christina Linder answered that any rule this committee ends up promulgating would go to the legislature in 2015. The committee will work through the 2014 legislative session.

Dr. Quarles then asked how the committee preferred to be communicated with outside the meeting: email, Edmodo, or some other means? The group seemed to agree that email was the best form of communication. Camille Wells told them she'd create a distribution list so they had each other's email and encourage them to reply all so everyone is included in the discussion. Paula Kellerer suggested Dropbox would be a more effective way for sharing documents and collaborating. Ms. Wells also volunteered to set up a Dropbox for committee members to post documents to.

Christina Linder, Director of Teacher Certification and Professional Standards at the State Department of Education, presented on prior state work in the area of tiered licensure. In 1999, the Maximizing Opportunities for Students and Teachers (MOST) Committee was formed. The committee worked for four years, and one of their recommendations was a tiered licensure system. In 2004, the recommendation was presented to the Idaho Legislature. The recommendation didn't outline all the details, but it did say they wanted both interim licensure and initial licensure. Both licenses are three year temporary licenses. One is for teachers coming from another state or out of an alternate route. The other is for teachers coming out of Idaho teacher preparation programs.

Then the MOST Committee recommended a professional licensure tier. Ms. Linder quoted from the MOST Committee recommendations: "Professional development team or an advisor verifies completed professional development plan that includes evidence of positive impact on student achievement and learning over the three year initial licensure period, a minimum of 60 Idaho professional development units, and to renew and activate professional development team verifies completed professional development plan that includes evidence of positive impact on student achievement and learning over the licensure period." The question is then, "What is evidence of positive impact on student achievement and how do we put supports in place for teachers?"

Currently Idaho only has a single tier of licensure. There's an interim level for teachers coming from out of state or through an alternate route who haven't yet met the state requirements. When a teacher comes from an Idaho teacher preparation program, the institution writes them a letter that says they are recommended for licensure. The State Department of Education accepts that letter and gives them an immediate five year license. Ms. Linder told the group that's not best practice, because it doesn't give the teacher the opportunity to be supported through an induction period.

To maintain a teaching certificate in Idaho, it currently requires three transcribed college credit hours (or the equivalent of 45 hours of professional learning that take place in the district or at a conference).

Idaho doesn't have any true leadership opportunities that rival going into administration in terms of additional compensation or recognition. Over the last four years, the state has created advanced leadership certificates and consulting teacher endorsements for specialized mathematics teachers helping with the Idaho Core Standards, but we still lose many teachers to administrative positions. They likely wouldn't leave if they had other paths to grow and provide leadership in.

Ms. Linder then transitioned to talking about what's happening in other states around tiered licensure. The American Institute of Research's Center on Great Teachers and Leaders helped put together a report for the Task Force on Improving Education. The report said that as of June 2013, fewer than 10 states used a single certificate. Approximately 21 states use a two-tier system, and at least 17 states use three or more tiers. Georgia has five tiers of licensure. The report also said having a tiered licensure system can help retain the best teachers, support professional learning, and serve as an accountability mechanism.

The American Institute of Research's report also detailed the "promising practices" or "must haves" of tiered licensure. The first was to build a continuum of expectations. "Licensure should support and promote state goals of educator development and improved student learning. This means the licensure system should embed a continuum of performance-based expectation and licensing assessments that begin with the novice and carry into advanced practice."

The second promising practice was to create opportunities for educators to learn, such as comprehensive induction systems and mentoring.

The third promising practice was to leverage relationships between preparation providers and the districts in which their candidates are placed.

The final promising practice was to utilize evaluation data to inform licensure decisions as one of multiple measures.

Idaho already had a number of these promising practices in place. The state adopted the Charlotte Danielson FfT as a single, statewide teacher evaluation model. Idaho has also looked at adopting a professional learning plan statewide that teachers will take with them from their preparation programs into their first years of teaching.

Barb Leeds asked who gets the plan when teachers come out of the colleges and universities. Ms. Linder responded that how and when the plan is transferred has yet to be determined. Ms. Leeds remarked that a professional learning plan wouldn't keep a district from hiring a candidate, but it would be helpful in keeping a teacher moving forward once they're hired.

Mikki Nuckols asked if this was embedded in the ABCTE final sign off. Ms. Linder responded that was part of the plan, to incorporate the same performance in ABCTE and Teach for America as will be expected of traditional colleges of education.

Lisa Burtenshaw asked if the statewide evaluation system had already been determined. Ms. Linder responded that the Danielson FfT has been in place for quite a while as the statewide evaluation framework. There will not be a new evaluation system coming out. Efforts in recent years have been focused around helping administrators implement that evaluation system with fidelity.

Christina explained that another area in which Idaho had been implementing promising practices was mentoring. The state was working on mentor training and creating standards for mentors up until about a year ago when funding resources ran out.

Idaho had already established many promising practices when CCSSO came out with their recommendation for how to transform teacher preparation earlier this year. Their report was called "Our Responsibility, Our Promise," and it was adopted by multiple states. CCSSO put forward a grant for states wishing to implement the ten recommendations in the report. The ten recommendations are consolidated in three areas: program approval, data systems, and multiple tiers of licensure. In regards to tiered licensure, the CCSSO report specifically says, "States will create multi-tiered licensure systems aligned to a coherent developmental continuum that reflects new performance expectations for educators and their implementation in the learning environment and to assessments that are linked to evidence of student achievement and growth."

Idaho secured one of the grants through CCSSO's competitive grant process based on the work that had already been done on performance based measures. The implementation plan that was put together for the grant was put together by a group of policy makers, many of which serve on this technical advisory committee. Adjustments can be made to the implementation plan by this committee.

The implementation plan included an initial tier of licensure for teachers entering from pre-service. The initial license would be a three-year license with performance measures studied during this time in order to determine advancement into professional licensure or trigger remediation. It also included a professional tier of teacher licensure that would be a five-year renewable license. Possible measures for renewing a professional license could include student learning objectives, student surveys, standardized statewide student assessment results, and teacher evaluations.

The CCSSO grant implementation plan also talks about a tiered licensure system for administrators. Under the implementation plan, like teacher licensure, administrators will have a three year period of induction, and a renewable Professional License shall be granted only if specific performance measures, aligned to the new Idaho Administrator Standards, have been successfully met.

Representative Harris asked how initial licensure would work with teachers entering from another state. Ms. Linder responded that we would likely put them on a three-year initial license until we determined if they were an effective teacher, but that would be up to the work of this committee. Dr. Quarles asked how we currently recognize whether a teacher is effective or not. Ms. Linder responded that the system is currently very input based—additional coursework that is part of Idaho licensure. Once that additional coursework has been met, the state asks for performance evaluations for the last year before awarding a full license.

Rep. Harris asked whether a student who is prepared out of state and wants to teach in Idaho will be disadvantaged because they won't come with a professional learning plan as part of their resume. Ms. Linder responded that if the preparation institution is nationally accredited through the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) or the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) then we put those students immediately on an interim license. If they're not prepared through an NCATE accredited school, the only way we can assure there's quality preparation is to have them get licensure in the state in which they are prepared. The reason is we have continually raised the bar on our own Idaho approved programs. If we are willing to let in anyone from any state without knowing they're meeting our increasingly high standards, we're not serving anyone well.

Robin Nettinga asked whether the State Board of Education approved or disapproved the standards portion of the MOST Committee's recommendations. Ms. Linder responded she has an August 2003 draft, which says the MOST Committee worked on tiered teacher licensure, professional development, and alternate routes to teacher licensure. In looking back through the archives, it appears the recommendations for alternate routes and professional development had been completed. It appears tiered licensure went before the legislature and was approved, but hadn't had any work done on it. Ms. Nettinga recalled other recommendations going before the State Board of Education prior to that legislative session, but being voted down.

Ms. Leeds remarked that she sees a significant difference in performance between teachers prepared in traditional programs versus American Board for Certification of Teacher Excellence (ABCTE) teachers. She asked if that would be addressed in tiered licensure. Ms. Linder said she sees the need for programs such as that if a teacher wants to add another area of endorsement. Without having the opportunity to practice and react, she sees a difference in how well prepared those teachers feel to take on those responsibilities, which is why a period of literature review of best practices was put into place. Generally, ABCTE teachers are hired in high needs districts where they have trouble recruiting. Different ways of coming into teaching are appropriate, but it's the work of this committee to make sure it's comparable and equally accountable. Superintendent Grover followed up by saying that often in rural

school districts the applicant teachers are not comparable to the applicants in larger school districts. It's difficult for rural school districts to find highly qualified teachers. Paula Kellerer said she hopes the committee can talk about how to use institutes of higher education to help qualify those teachers in rural districts as quickly as possible.

Dr. Quarles shared with the group that there are only nine teacher preparation programs in Idaho, so we're not dealing with as many teacher preparation programs as other states are in establishing initial criteria for licensure. Idaho is further along than most of the other seven states participating in the CCSSO grant, who are just beginning to have a conversation about teacher preparation.

Jason Hancock presented on the career ladder recommendation of the Task Force for Improving Education. Tiered licensure and a career ladder are two different things, but they are related to each other. The career ladder is dependent on a tiered licensure system, because that's how the career ladder is structured to run. Tiered licensure isn't technically dependent on career ladder to work, but not meaningful without it.

Mr. Hancock walked the committee through a series of spreadsheets showing the mechanics of the career ladder in the task force recommendations (available online at <http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/tieredLicensure/docs/Career%20Ladder%20Calculations.pdf>).

The second table on the first page shows how many FTE (certificated instructional personnel) are in each of the cells on the current salary grid for FY2013. In order to run calculations on how much a career ladder would cost, you must first know how many people are in each of the cells.

The third table shows the projected FTE, or predicted growth in hiring of staff, in each cell for FY2015.

The fourth table shows the level of state funding for each of the cells in the salary reimbursement grid. The portion shaded in the table shows what is governed by minimum salary. Regardless of what dollar figure is in that cell, those FTE are funded up to the minimum salary, which is \$31,000.

The next table on page 3 shows the fiscal impact of the first year of a career ladder. In year one, every teacher would be put on the career ladder where they are on the current grid rounded up to the next nearest cell. For example, step one is at \$33,000 in year one. Anyone below \$33,000 on the current grid is put in step one. The master teacher rung is not available until year two. That creates a need for "ghost steps." The professional teacher rung would normally top out at \$44,000, but we have cells on the current grid already above \$44,000, and no one goes backwards on the career ladder. Ghost steps at \$1,000 increments provide places to put those teachers already above \$44,000. In later years, those ghost steps will disappear as the starting point increases and flows those through the whole schedule. Step five eventually gets large enough that everyone who was on a ghost step ends up on a step.

There is also a pool of money available for leadership awards. That distribution would be based on a calculation of \$1,000 for every teacher with three or more years of experience plus that state paid employer benefit rate, totaling \$15.9 million.

The first year of the career ladder would cost \$42,447,488. \$15,920,019 is the leadership award pool and \$26,527,468 is the additional career ladder compensation.

Ms. Burtenshaw asked if the committee decided the professional teacher or master teacher could advance more quickly if the cost would be higher. Hancock responded that the movement across the ladder is based on years of experience. Each year a teacher moves another step to the right until they max out. To move down, that's where the tiered licensure comes into play, and that's the work of this committee—to design a system that governs the movement from rung to rung.

Ms. Burtenshaw followed up by asking if the committee decided teachers could move more quickly from rung to rung whether there would be a significant increase in the cost from year to year. Dr. Quarles responded that this committee's conversation would be purely around tiered licensure. The committee needs an understanding of how the career ladder and tiered licensure coincide, but Dr. Quarles didn't want the committee to get lost on the implementation of the career ladder. Mr. Hancock explained that legislation around the career ladder will be drafted at some point and given to the stakeholders that were involved in developing the Task Force recommendation for feedback. That process will be separate from what this committee's doing.

In year two of the career ladder, the initial starting point is increased by \$1,250 from \$33,000 to \$34,250. That increase flows through the schedule, so step five makes the first ghost step disappear. FTE also move through the schedule, and there's cost associated with that. A standard attrition rate is applied in this model, but not a calculation for growth. The model is based on a static number of teachers per year. The model assumes that in year two people are eligible to move to master teacher licensure status.

Rep. Harris asked whether we imagine the bubble that was all the teachers with minimum salaries grouped together on step one in year moving through the system or spread out through the system. Mr. Hancock responded that with this model you don't have that differentiation, and it doesn't propose to change that. It simply moves all the teachers currently at minimum salary teacher from \$31,000 to \$33,000. You'll see more differentiation as they become eligible to move from the professional tier to the master tier. Until then, they move together, which is why when you get to year four in the model, you can't afford to raise the starting point very much. In the second year it goes up by \$1,250. In the third year it goes up by \$1,750, but in year four it only goes up by \$250, because that's when that large group of teachers who are currently at the minimum salary are eligible to move to higher rungs. Rungs are worth \$7,000 and steps are worth \$1,000. Salary is driven more by quality of work.

Rep. Harris asked where a novice license would be allowed to be renewed for a second three-year period. Mr. Hancock responded he didn't recall that in the task force recommendations. He believed it was an "up or out" situation, but that would get to the work of this committee. What kinds of standards should be set for moving from tier to tier and how long to allow for movement is the tiered licensure system.

Mr. Hancock added that another area that pay can differentiate is in the leadership area. Which teachers are given leadership awards is a district determination.

In year three, the starting point increases by another \$1,750 or \$36,000. By now, all of the ghost steps have been consumed by step five.

In year four, we can only afford to move the starting point by \$250, because there's such a large group of teachers qualifying to move up to the professional and/or master rungs.

In year five, the starting point increases by \$1,750 up to \$38,000.

In year six, the starting point increase by \$2,000 up to \$40,000. This would create a starting point on the professional teacher run that would start at \$47,000 and would range to \$51,000. The master teacher rung would range from \$54,000 to \$58,000. Any leadership award dollars earned would be on top of that. The cost that year, like the others, is approximately \$42 million.

The last page of the spreadsheet lists the assumption that went into building the model. One of the key assumptions is that 25% of teachers that obtain the professional rung will then qualify for the master rung. That's an estimate, and that estimate has major implications for the projected cost of the model. If the actual number is less, the career ladder won't cost as much. If the actual number is more, the career ladder will cost more.

Ms. Nettinga asked whether the starting point increase of \$250 in year four was because of people the number of people moving rungs that year or an attempt to keep the cost at approximately \$42 million. Mr. Hancock answered that the dollar figure that you can afford to raise the starting point up to each year is a number you back in to. If you keep the costs level at \$42 million each year, you run the model and the costs associated with people moving. Once you absorb that, you throw different number at that starting point increase cell until you get to \$42 million.

Dr. Quarles followed up that quite a few people on the task force wanted to keep it as close to \$42 million to keep it realistic. Mr. Hancock explained that a \$42 million increase in the Public Schools Budget is an increase of just over 3% a year. That's why you saw the superintendent's budget request for FY2015 was 5.9%. Three percent of the increase was tied up just in the career ladder. However, the PERSI board recently decided not to go forward with a rate increase, so the request will go down to 5.4%, because the \$7.2 million budgeted for a rate increase will be pulled out.

Rep. Harris asked for confirmation that the model assumed 680 new teachers each year and how student enrollment inflation might affect the model. Hancock confirmed that 680 is the number of new teacher hires, based on our most recent year of experience. There's an amount of teacher turnover in a district every year, but a percentage of those teachers move to another district in the state of Idaho. That turnover doesn't affect a statewide career ladder model, because those teachers would be funded the same way. The 680 new teachers last year were truly new to the teaching field in Idaho. If we start to see student population growth like we saw in the 1990's and early 2000's, that figure will get substantially larger.

The committee then took a fifteen minute break.

Dr. Quarles then presented on the tiered licensure recommendation of the Task Force for Improving Education. Christina Linder gave the disclaimer that the tiered licensure model presented to the Governor's Task Force was a possible model based on models from multiple different states. It's a culmination of best practices, but not necessarily the model this committee must adopt.

Dr. Quarles then began explaining the basics of the three stage tiered licensure model by saying that all candidates must receive a basic score or better on the Idaho Pedagogical Performance Assessment (IPPA) in order to qualify for initial licensure. The initial licensure would last for three years. Some sort of criteria or standards would have to be met before becoming eligible to move to professional licensure, including scoring proficient in all categories of the IPPA. If that criteria wasn't met, there'd be

an intensive year of remediation and mentoring. It's also possible in this model that a teacher could move out of initial licensure and into professional licensure in under three years, if they meet the standards and criteria in less time.

The professional license in this model is a five-year renewable certificate with certain requirements for renewal. If for three out of the five years a teacher was mostly proficient, but had a lot of areas of deficiency, a district could put that teacher on an improvement plan and/or return the teacher to initial licensure. However, once that teacher goes into an improvement plan, they only have three years to get their skills back up to par and get back to professional licensure.

Ms. Leeds commented that the Meridian School District has a three level plan, with the last level being probation. She then asked how tiered licensure would affect the district's probationary status. Ms. Linder responded that was something the committee would have to discuss.

At some point in time, the teacher would have the opportunity to move to a two-year teacher leader license. They would have to demonstrate some level of mastery in a variety of components on the IPPA to qualify as a teacher leader. A teacher could go back and forth between professional licensure and teacher leader licensure in this model.

Dr. Quarles' next slide explained the IPPA. The assessment is score on a rubric of 1-4. Minimally, a candidate must score a 2, or basic, for initial licensure. This assessment is currently being implemented across all teacher preparation programs in Idaho. University supervisors are being trained and will be certified evaluators on this assessment.

Another appealing portion of the IPPA to the task force was that it includes an Individualized Professional Learning Plan (IPLP). The IPLP would help guide the district as to what supports the teacher would need once they are hired.

Christina Linder explained that if the initial licensees that were ready and able to meet all the criteria to move from initial licensure into professional licensure after only one year were all coming from the same teacher preparation programs, the state would want to recognize and replicate the best practices in those teacher preparation programs.

Ms. Linder also explained that the Charlotte Danielson FfT is the performance piece of the IPPA. Other measures would then be added to the Framework for Teaching.

Not all administrators are equally prepared or effective. Sometimes a teacher questions the evaluation they're given. A teacher could essentially challenge the evaluation and request an outside evaluator. The MET study has shown that if three different evaluators observe a teacher for as little as fifteen minutes they can make an effective assessment of that teacher's performance. In order to help give teachers confidence in the system, a lesson could be videotaped and sent out to three objective evaluators for assessment.

Ms. Leeds commented that the Meridian School District has instituted a requirement that each teacher has two different observers in classroom observations, and it has helped their district address concerns that administrators just don't like a particular teacher. In elementary schools where there's only one principal, the principal is paired with another school's principal. Paula Kellerer commented that the same thing is happening in higher education.

Dr. Quarles then went over the teacher leader license. In this model, a teacher leader license would guarantee release time for leadership responsibilities and a pay increase. Additional responsibilities and requirements would include service to the district or higher education partner, successful 360 degree assessments, and maintaining proficient to mastery level in their teaching responsibilities.

Ms. Linder added that as the task force also began considering a career ladder, it became potentially more problematic to have teachers going back and forth between a professional license and a teacher leader license. One of the possible thoughts was that once you get up to the mastery level, you wouldn't drop down in pay, but when you were fulfilling leadership responsibilities some of the leadership dollars would go to support that.

Dr. Quarles then transitioned the committee to talking about a list of essential questions, borrowed from Georgia's Tiered Licensure Task Force, for designing a tiered licensure system. Ms. Linder told the group that Idaho should come up with a similar list of questions in developing a tiered licensure system. She asked them to read through the list of questions and prioritize them on a scale from 1-3 which questions the committee needed to address (1 being something the committee must address and 3 being something staff can handle).

At the end of the exercise, the following list of questions was generated by using some of the same questions as Georgia used and adding additional questions:

Questions for/about tiers:

- What are the standards/requirements you have to meet to attain the certificate?
- How do you assess these standards?
- What safeguards and procedures are needed to ensure this attainment/renewal is fair, reliable, and valid (e.g., issues related to potential bias, teachers who have a lapse in service or other circumstances that may make it difficult to demonstrate performance)?
- How is professional learning related to the standards at each tier?
- What is the purpose of each tier and will what we are creating serve that purpose?

Questions about implementation:

- What is our plan for seeking and using input as the task force is developing this system? (Identification of stakeholders)
- What is our plan for grandfathering/phasing in veteran teachers?
- What safeguards are in place to protect the integrity of the tiered certification system?
- How will we know the tiered certification system effectively supports teaching and learning?
- What is the implementation plan for all roles associated with implementation: school and system level leaders, program providers, SDE, SBOE for each tier?

Additional questions for presenters from other states:

- What was the rationale for moving to a tiered licensure system?
- How is the system tied to compensation?
- What were the successes and barriers?
- What would be done differently?
- What evidence is there that the tiered licensure system was successful?
- Have you tied tiered licensure to specific evaluation frameworks (like Danielson)?

These questions will be given to next month's speakers to inform their presentations on their states' systems.

Ms. Nettinga said it's critical to have a plan for seeking and using input in developing a tiered licensure system.

For the next meeting, the committee recommended seeking out states to present that have been doing tiered licensure for a while, have done an evaluation of their tiered licensure system, are in close proximity to Idaho (neighboring states), and have similar demographics.

Ms. Burtenshaw asked whether members of the legislature would like to see a differentiated pay plan tied to a tiered licensure plan. Ms. Linder said she can only speak to her conversations with Task Force members, and she believes there's been an interest in tiered licensure pre-dating differential pay. The Task Force recognized the necessity of a strong induction and support for new teachers. One of the ways we've seen states embrace that is a distinct period of novice licensure. A continuum of progression for teachers was part of the impetus for looking at this. The desire to better compensate teachers and have performance evidence is a way of doing that. Dr. Quarles responded that it came up several times in the Task Force that if we're going to look at having a career ladder, we have to look at having it tied to a system of tiered licensure.

Tracie Bent added that even prior to the Task Force recommendations, we've looked at this before and thought it was a good idea, but it didn't get implemented. New studies have come out recently indicating that it is a best practice for licensure.

Ms. Linder said she would work with contacts at the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) to identify states that meet as many of the committee's criteria as possible to present on their systems at the next committee meeting.

The next meeting of the Tiered Licensure Technical Advisory Committee will be November 25, 2013, beginning at 9:00 am/MT.

The committee adjourned at 4:18 pm.